UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/801,641	03/17/2004	Antti K. Laurila	60282.00163	1701

32294   7590   12/12/2007
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P.
14TH FLOOR
8000 TOWERS CRESCENT
TYSONS CORNER, VA 22182

EXAMINER
WU, JIANYE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2616	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/801,641	LAURILA ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Jianye Wu	2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>*17 October 2007*</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5-14,16-40 and 42-53* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5-14,16-40 and 42-53* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2.   **Claims 1-3, 5-14, 16-40, 42-53** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

For independent **claim 1, 38, 47** and **50-53**, Claim language in the following claims is not clearly understood:

a) Claim 1 recites from lines 8-13:

> "wherein one of a network element and a function of the first network sends Lawful Interception (LI) information *either* directly to one of a support node of the second network, an Administration Function (ADMF), and a Delivery Function (DF), and
> wherein a Mapping Function is provided which translates target indications of the first network to corresponding target indications of the second network associated with a same monitored user."

It is not clear the meaning of the above wording, especially the part after word *either*.

b) Independent claims 38, 47 and 50-53 have the similar problem as claim 1.

The remaining claims depend from independent claims, therefore, are rejected for the same reason.

For examination on the merits, the claims will be interpreted as the best understood.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2.   **Claim 51** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Regarding **claim 51**, the claimed software is non-statutory subject matter since it is not a process, machine, manufacture nor composition of matter; nor it is recorded on some computer-readable medium, see MPEP 2106(IV)(B)(1).

Claim 30 lacks the proper preamble language for statutory computer program product. See MPEP 2100 for guidance on computer related inventions.

The examiner suggests a preamble as follows:

"A computer readable medium containing computer executable instructions to perform a method, the method comprising:"

Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4.   **Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-10, 12, 14, 16-17, 19-27, 29-30, 32-40, 42-43, 47-48**

and **50-53** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Maki et al

(US 2004/0228362 A1, hereinafter **Maki**).

For **claims 1, 38, 47** and **50-53,** Maki discloses a method in claim 1, a

system in claim 38, a network element in claims 47, 50, 52-53, a computer

medium in claim 51 encoded computer executable instructions for intercepting at

least one session involving at least a first network (network 1, line 3 of [0016])

and a second network (network 2, line 5 of [0016]) of different types, the method

comprising:

monitoring signaling information (SIP signaling, line 4 of [0006]), provided

in at least one of the first and second networks, of the at least one session (SIP,

line 1 of [0006]), and session content (in the packets belong to the same stream,

lines 8-9 of [0006]) related to the same at least one session provided in another

of the first and second networks;

wherein an indication to start interception is delivered between the first

and second networks (Fig. 1 or Fig. 6)

wherein one of a network element and a function of the first network sends

LI (Lawful Interception, [0007], lines 4-6) information either directly to one of a

support node of the second network, an Administration Function (ADMF, [0023],

last line), and a Delivery Function (DF);

Maki is silent on wherein a Mapping Function is provided which translates

target indications of the first network to corresponding target indications of the

second network associated with a same monitored user.

However, Maki discloses that Law Enforcement Agency (LEA, [0016], last

line) is cable of capturing any data belongs to any user ([0016]), therefore, LEA is

able to capture the data associated with a particularly monitored user.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the invention to capture the data associated with a particularly

monitored user.

As to **claims 2** and **39** Maki discloses the method according to claim 1

and a system according to claim 38 wherein the step of monitoring signalling

information comprises monitoring signalling information provided in an IP

Multimedia Subsystem (IMS) network (3GPP IMS network, line 14 of [0042]).

As to **claim 3** and **40**, Maki discloses the method according to claim 1 and

a system according to claim 38, wherein the step of monitoring session content

comprises monitoring session content provided in a General Packet Radio

Service (GPRS) network (last line of [0040]).

As to **claim 5** and **42**, Maki discloses the method according to claim 1 and

a system according to claim 38, wherein said one of the network element and the

function of the first network is a Control State Control Function (P-CSCF of Fig.

6).

As to **claim 6** and **43**, Maki discloses the method according to claim 1 and

a system according to claim 38, wherein the ADMF (ADMF of Fig. 6) is included

in the signaling path and commands a support node of the second network to

start the interception.

As to **claim 8**, Maki discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein

the LI information is sent during media authorization (lines 1-3 of [0020]).

As to **claim 9**, Maki discloses the according to claim 1, wherein the LI

information is sent to a Gateway General Packet Radio Service Support Node

(GGSN, Fig. 6) from a Proxy-Call State Control Function (P-CSCF, Fig. 6).

As to **claim 10**, Maki discloses the method according to claim 9, wherein,

when the GGSN receives the LI information, it starts the interception of the

content of communication related to the IP Multimedia Subsystem (IMS) session,

and delivers the information to a Serving GPRS Support Node (SGSN, Fig. 6) by

attaching the LI information received from the P-CSCF to a Create PDP Context

Response message (lines 12 of [0058]; or M10 in Fig. 4), which the SGSN in turn

starts the interception of content of communication related to the IMS session

(M17 and M18 of Fig. 4).

As to **claim 12** and **44**, Maki discloses the method according to claim 1

and a system according to claim 38, wherein the ADMF performs actual

interception activation in a Control State Control Function (P-CSCF of Fig. 6) and

a General Packet Radio Service Support Node (SGGN or GGSN of Fig. 6) and

sends the same LI information to these networks elements, wherein information

on a need of interception is stored in the GSN, wherein one of the CSCF and a

Policy Decision Function (PDF, lines 3-4 of [0054])) of the CSCF includes only an

indication of the interception need in the authorization decision (M10 or M11 of

Fig. 4).

As to **claim 14**, Maki discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein

the interception by the second network is activated by the first network based on

mapping of an IP Multimedia Subsystem (3GPP IMS network, line 14 of [0042])

identity to a General Packet Radio Service Support Node (GPRS) identity (last

line of [0040]).

As to **claim 16**, Maki discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein

the Mapping Function is provided in the ADMF (ADMF of Fig. 6) which receives

Lawful Interception information (lines 4-6 of [0007]) related to a session in the

second network when the session is started (lines 4-6 of [0019]).

As to **claim 17**, Maki discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein

the Mapping Function is provided in the ADMF which receives session identifiers

of the first network when the session in the first network is started (lines 4-6 of

[0019]).

As to **claim 19**, Maki discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein

the interception in the first network is activated based on an examination of

content of communication (CC) of the second network (Filter, Fig. 6).

As to **claim 20**, Maki discloses the method according to claim 19, wherein

an entity (DF3 or GGSN of Fig. 6) checks (checks, line 3 of [0069]) a message

received from a support node (The intercepting node, line 2 of [0069]) of the

second network for detecting Lawful Interception (LI) information, and forwards

such information, if found, to a Mapping Function, the Mapping Function

resolving the LI information to a user identity of the first network (lines 5-8 of

[0069]), wherein one of a network element and a function of the first network is

commanded to start interception using the resolved user identity (Fig. 4).

As to **claim 21**, Maki discloses the method according to claim 20, wherein

the Mapping Function is a Mapping Function of one of another network element

and a function, the one of the another network element and the function

commanding the one of the network element and the function of the first network

to start interception using the resolved user identity (lines 1-3 of [0070]).

As to **claim 22**, Maki discloses the method according to claim 20, wherein

the Mapping Function is located in a Delivery Function 3 (DF 3 of Fig. 6).

As to **claim 23**, Maki discloses the method according to claim 20, wherein

the entity is a Delivery Function (DF3 of Fig. 6).

As to **claim 24**, Maki discloses the method according to claim 20, wherein

the entity is a Support Node of the second network (GGSN of Fig. 6).

As to **claim 25**, Maki discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein

the interception in the first network is activated based on a mapping of an identity

of a user used in the second network to an identity of the same user in the first

network

As to **claim 26**, Maki discloses the method according to claim 25, wherein

a media authorization is performed between the first and second networks, a

User Equipment (UE, Fig. 4) sends an Authorization Token to the second

network which Authorization Token represents a session being created in the first

network, the Authorization Token being reported to a Mapping Function (part of

ADMF of Fig. 4) in a Lawful Interception (LI) information message which includes

a user identity used in the second network, the Mapping Function activating

interception in the first network (Fig. 4).

As to **claim 27**, Maki discloses the method according to claim 26, wherein

the Mapping Function is a Mapping function of an Administration Function

(ADMF of Fig. 4).

As to **claim 29**, Maki discloses the method according to claim 25, wherein

an Administration Function (ADMF, Fig. 4) receives Lawful Interception (LI)

information containing a session identifier used in the first network (M12 of Fig. 4)

from a network element of the second network, the ADMF uses the session

identifier directly for interception activation in the first network (M15 of Fig. 4).

As to **claim 30**, Maki discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein

the interception in the first network is activated based on upload of Lawful

Interception (LI) information from a network element of the second network (Fig.

4, such as M14).

As to **claim 32**, Maki discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein

information of matching triggers of the first network is forwarded to the second

network by using identities known in the second network (lines 7-9 in [0009]; or

Fig. 4).

As to **claim 33**, Maki discloses the method according to claim 32, wherein

the used identities are one of an International Mobile Subscriber Identity (IMSI,

line 2 of [0008]) and a combination of a General Packet Radio Service (GPRS,

line 2 of [0005]) Charging ID and a Gateway General Packet Radio Service

Support Node (GGSN, Fig. 6) identification (lines 3-10 of [0009]).

As to **claim 34**, Maki discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein

the decision of interception is done for every session created in the first network

(lines 7-9 in [0009]).

As to **claim 35**, Maki discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein

the decision of interception issued for a session created in the first network is

maintained in the first network after a termination of the session for use for at

least one following session (lines 8-9 of [0005]).

As to **claim 36**, Maki discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein

monitoring in the first network is activated by sending information to the first

network when the interception is originally activated using target identifiers of the

second network (DF3 of Fig. 6).

As to **claim 37**, Maki discloses the method according to claim 36, wherein

the target identifiers are one of an International Mobile Subscriber Identity (IMSI,

line 2 of [0008]), a Mobile Subscriber ISDN Number (MSISDN, line 3 of [0008]),

and an International Mobile Equipment Identity (IMEI, line 4 of [0008]).

As to **claim 48**, Maki discloses the network element according to claim 47,

further comprising a mediation function (DF3 or GGSN of Fig. 6).

5.   **Claims 7** and **31** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Maki in view of 3GPP TS 29.207 V5.5.1 (2003-10) (hereinafter

3GPP29.207) and 3GPP TS 33.107 V6.0.0 (2003-09) (hereinafter **3GPP33.107**).

As to **claim 7**, Maki discloses the method according to claim 4, wherein

the LI information is sent from one of a Call State Control Function (CSCF) and a

Policy Decision Function (PDF) of a CSCF to a General Packet Radio Service

(GPRS) support node.

Maki **is silent on** Go-interface and an X1_1-interface.

3GPP29.207 discloses Go-interface (lines 1-6 of Section 4.1, page 9) and

3GPP33.107 discloses X1_1-interface (Section 5.1.1, Page 12).

Maki, 3GPP29.207 and 3GPP33.107 teach the same art; 3GPP29.207

and 3GPP33.107 provides more detailed information on the subject.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the invention to modified Maki by adding information from

3GPP29.207 and 3GPP33.107 to provide more detailed and completed

description for the benefit of better understanding of the subject.

As to **claim 31**, Maki discloses the method according to claim 30, but **is**

silent on wherein the LI information is uploaded over a Go interface.

3GPP29.207 discloses Go-interface (lines 1-6 of Section 4.1, page 9),

over which LI information uploaded. Maki and 3GPP29.207 teach the same art;

3GPP33.107 provides more detailed information on the subject.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the invention to modified Maki by adding information from

3GPP29.207 to provide more detailed and completed description for the benefit

of better understanding of the subject.

6.   **Claims 11, 13, 18, 28, 45-46** and **49** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maki in view of 3GPP TS 29.207 V5.5.1 (2003-10) (hereinafter **3GPP29.207**) and 3GPP TS 33.107 V6.0.0 (2003-09) (hereinafter **3GPP33.107**).

As to **claim 11**, Maki discloses the method according to claim 10, but **is silent on** wherein, in case of an inter-SGSN handover, the LI information is transferred from an old SGSN of a monitored user to a new SGSN.

3GPP33.107 discloses handover (Section 6.3.3.4, Page 23).

Maki and 3GPP33.107 teach the same art; 3GPP33.107 provides more detailed information on the subject.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modified Maki by adding information from 3GPP33.107 to provide more detailed and completed description for the benefit of better understanding of the subject.

As to **claim 13**, Maki discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein the interception by the second network is activated by the first network wherein Lawful Interception (LI) information is sent from a Control State Control Function (CSCF) then sends the LI information to a General Packet Radio Service Support Node (GSN).

Maki **is silent on** using a Delivery Function 2 (DF2).

3GPP33.107 discloses DF2 (Section 5.1.1, Page 12).

Maki and 3GPP33.107 teach the same art; 3GPP33.107 provides more detailed information on the subject.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modified Maki by adding information from 3GPP33.107 to provide more detailed and completed description for the benefit of better understanding of the subject.

As to **claim 18**, Maki discloses the method according to claim 15, but **is silent on** wherein the Mapping Function is located in a DF2.

3GPP33.107 discloses Mapping Function is located in a DF2 (Figure 15, Section 6.3 in Page 19).

Maki and 3GPP33.107 teach the same art; 3GPP33.107 provides more detailed information on the subject.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modified Maki by adding information from 3GPP33.107 to provide more detailed and completed description for the benefit of better understanding of the subject.

As to **claim 28**, Maki discloses the method according to claim 26, but **is silent on** wherein the Mapping Function is located in a DF2.

3GPP33.107 discloses Mapping Function is located in a DF2 (Figure 15, Section 6.3 in Page 19).

Maki and 3GPP33.107 teach the same art; 3GPP33.107 provides more detailed information on the subject.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modified Maki by adding information from

3GPP33.107 to provide more detailed and completed description for the benefit

of better understanding of the subject.

As to **claim 45**, Maki discloses the system according to claim 38,

comprising one of an Administration Function (ADMF), but **is silent on** DF2 and

DF3.

3GPP33.107 discloses Mapping Function is located in a DF2 (Figure 15,

Section 6.3 in Page 19) and DF3 (Figure 12 in Section 6.1 of Page 17).

Maki and 3GPP33.107 teach the same art; 3GPP33.107 provides more

detailed information on the subject.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the invention to modified Maki by adding information from

3GPP33.107 to provide more detailed and completed description for the benefit

of better understanding of the subject.

As to **claim 46**, Maki discloses the system according to claim 45, wherein

the one of the ADMF, but **is silent on** DF2 and DF3.

3GPP33.107 discloses Mapping Function is located in a DF2 (Figure 15,

Section 6.3 in Page 19) and DF3 (Figure 12 in Section 6.1 of Page 17).

Maki and 3GPP33.107 teach the same art; 3GPP33.107 provides more

detailed information on the subject.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the invention to modified Maki by adding information from

3GPP33.107 to provide more detailed and completed description for the benefit

of better understanding of the subject.

As to **claim 49**, Maki discloses the network element according to claim 47, being implemented as one of an Administration Function (ADMF), but **is silent on** DF2 and DF3.

3GPP33.107 discloses Mapping Function is located in a DF2 (Figure 15, Section 6.3 in Page 19) and DF3 (Figure 12 in Section 6.1 of Page 17).

Maki and 3GPP33.107 teach the same art; 3GPP33.107 provides more detailed information on the subject.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modified Maki by adding information from 3GPP33.107 to provide more detailed and completed description for the benefit of better understanding of the subject.

Response to Amendments/Arguments

7.   Applicant's arguments filed on 09/26/2007 with respect to the rejections based on 35 U.S.C. §112 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of newly amended claims 1-3, 5-14, 16-40, 41-53, as described in this Office Action above.

8.   Applicant's arguments filed on 09/26/2007 with respect to the rejections based on 35 U.S.C. §102/103 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

9.   For claim 1, Applicant amends the claim, then makes arguments based the amended claim against the first Office Action, which does not seem to make

a lot of sense. This Office Action makes a rejection to the amended claim above. Specifically, Applicant argues:

a) Maki does not teach or suggest that "a message ... includes lawful interception information" (line 5-8 of page 24);

b) Maki does not teach or suggest "a Mapping Function is provided which translates target indications of the first network to corresponding target indications of the second network associated with a same monitored user." (line 10-13 of page 24);

In response, the rejection is now made based on 35 U.S.C. 103(a) due to the claim amendment. More specifically,

a) Maki discloses LI in [0007], lines 4-6, as shown in claim 1 above;

b) Maki discloses that Law Enforcement Agency (LEA, [0016], last line) is cable of capturing any data belongs to any user ([0016]), therefore, LEA is able to capture the data associated with a particularly monitored user, as shown in claim 1 above.

10.   Applicant makes the same argument on independent claims 38, 47, and 50-53 (second full paragraph of page 25). In response, since they recite similar limitation as claim 1, therefore, are rejected as explained in claim 1 above.

11.   For rejections based on 35 U.S.C. 103(a) (page 25-29), Applicant argues

a) Maki cannot be used as a prior art for 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection (last paragraph of page 26);

b) 3GP29.207 does not relate to Lawful Interception (LI) information (2nd paragraph of page 27);

In response:

a) If Applicant believes that Maki cannot be used as a prior art based on

35 U.S.C. 103(c), he needs to submit an affidavits or declaration under 37 CFR

1.132 to prove that the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time

the claimed invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an

obligation of assignment to the same person, which Applicant fails to submit.

b) Specification clearly shows 3GP29.207 teaches LI ([0043]), as it recites

"A flow identifier is defined in 3GPP TS 29.207 V5.2.0 (Annex C), for example,

and is generally used for the identification of an IP flow within a media

component associated with a SIP session. The flow identifier includes the format

of <Media component no, IP flow no>. According to this example, this flow

identifier is used as a media component identification in interception activation."

12.   All independent claims have been amended, therefore, Applicant's

arguments with respect to the rejections based on 35 U.S.C. §102/103 in the first

Office Action are moot. Rejections are made based on the newly amend claims

1-3, 5-14, 16-40, 41-53, as described in this Office Action above.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection

presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**.

See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as

set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire

THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is

filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory

action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory

period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory

action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be

calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will

the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to Jianye Wu whose telephone number is

(571)270-1665. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday,

8am to 7pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, Seema Rao can be reached on (571)272-3174. The fax

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from

the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information

for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-

free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service

Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-

9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jianye Wu

12/04/07

SEEMA S. RAO 12/10/07
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600